



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/585,146

06/30/2006

Kei Watanabe

IWI-16714

9933

7609 7590 03/24/2010

RANKIN, HILL & CLARK LLP  
23755 Lorain Road - Suite 200  
North Olmsted, OH 44070-2224

EXAMINER

OGDEN JR, NECHOLUS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/24/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/585,146	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WATANABE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Necholus Ogden, Jr.	<b>Art Unit</b> 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3-17-2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3-17-2010 has been entered.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The electronic copy of the claims appears to have a word that did not properly transmit. Claim 1, line 8 does not clearly show the word "formed" as it should read. Appropriate correction is required.

3.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 1796

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1, 3-10 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by EP (1488775) was withdrawn in final office action mailed 11-3-2009.

8. Claims 1, 3-10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over EP (1488775).

EP '775 disclose a clear liquid skin cleansing formulation comprising at least one nonionic surfactant; a second nonionic surfactant other than the first; a liquid oil ingredient and up to 12% by weight of water (abstract). EP '775 disclose that said nonionic surfactants include POE fatty acid esters and/or ethers such as POE (8) glyceryl monoisostearate (page 3, lines 24-36); liquid oils such as liquid paraffin and silicone oils (0021); and further said compositions include higher fatty acids and higher fatty alcohols having an IOB of 0.6 or lower (0026-0030). See Tables 1-6.

EP '775 is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions for the same utility.

9. Applicant's arguments filed 3-17-2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues and declares in his Declaration submitted on March 17, 2010, that EP '775, when mixed with water in a ratio of 4:6 exhibits a white turbid appearance that turbid and a two phase system being oil phase and micellar aqueous solution wherein both characteristics are in contrast to the present application that states a clear solution and a micellar aqueous solution or a bicontinuous microemulsion phase.

The examiner respectfully contends that first, applicant's claims do not require an appearance limitation such as clarity. Specifically, there is no mention of a clear solution in any of the amended claims and therefore the prior art of record, is not bound as such. Secondly, applicant's conditions 1 and 2 and that the composition comprises less than 5% water and that said solution forms a micellar aqueous solution or a bicontinuous microemulsion phase when mixed with water at a ratio of 4:6. Nothing in these conditions precludes the prior art from forming additional phases as declared by applicant. Applicant states in his declaration at Table 1 that a micellar aqueous solution and an oil phase was formed in EP '775, however, the claims do not preclude additional phases from forming nor has applicant provided any deleterious effect to the contrary. It

Art Unit: 1796

appears that the 2 condition was met by EP '775 when a micellar aqueous solution was formed as declared by applicant.

With respect to the Declaration, it is noted that applicant chose to run examples 5-8 of Table I of EP '775 to support his argument, however, it is the examiners opinion that additional test should have been run from other examples of EP '775 which comprise various fatty acid esters, and oils. Accordingly, it is determined that criticality has not been met.

**To establish unexpected results over a claimed range, applicants should compare a sufficient number of tests both inside and outside the claimed range to show the criticality of the claimed range. In re Hill, 284 F.2d 955, 128 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1960).**

**An obviousness determination is not the result of a rigid formula disassociated from the consideration of the facts of a case. Indeed, the common sense of those skilled in the art demonstrates why some combinations would have been obvious where others would not. See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 2007 WL 1237837, at \*12 (2007) ("The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.").**

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Necholas Ogden, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-1322. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thu.

Art Unit: 1796

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Necholus Ogden, Jr./  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1796

no